

of each of the more than 7,000 employees of the enterprise.

The cut will be restored if and when the planned level of output and productivity is reached.

SOFIA IS APPEASED ON YUGOSLAV ROAD

BELGRADE, August 8.—One fruit of the new friendly relations between Yugoslavia and the Soviet bloc will benefit thousands of tourists regardless of their political views.

The Yugoslavs have finally agreed to pave the highway between the south Serbian city of Nis and the Bulgarian border, a part of the main European trunk route to Istanbul. This would mean the modernization of one of the most fearsome stretches of high road to be found in the Balkans.

Although only about 50 miles long, this road is dreaded by every motorist who has ever been on it. Narrow and winding, the graveled road is full of potholes and eroded washboard surfaces.

DISASTERS ARE COMMON

Only the most careless of motorists would dream of taking the stretch at more than 20 to 25 miles an hour. Even at such speeds disasters are common. One motorist who made the trip recently arrived in Nis with two broken shock absorbers, a punctured oil pan, two blowouts and a conviction that his car would never be the same again.

The Bulgarians have been trying to get the Yugoslavs to do something about the road for some time. It is important to Sofia since it is the route Bulgarian trucks use in carrying goods to the West. It also is the most direct route for tourists coming into Bulgaria from Italy, Austria and southern Germany.

But the Yugoslavs previously had turned a deaf ear. A Bulgarian delegation that came to Belgrade early this year prepared to offer both materials and manpower to the Yugoslavs to help reconstruct the highway went home emptyhanded.

NOT IN 5-YEAR PLAN

A Yugoslav highway official blandly said at a news conference about that time that no work on the road was foreseen under the nation's current 5-year plan, which extends through 1965.

Since then, however, relations between Yugoslavia and the Soviet-bloc countries have grown warmer. In May, Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union made a special trip to Sofia to spell out to the somewhat recalcitrant Bulgarians the need to look on Belgrade with a less jaundiced eye.

What the Bulgarians have done to follow, this new line is not apparent. But, they must have done something, because Yugoslav and Bulgarian officials signed an agreement in Sofia recently that "accelerated building and modernization" of the road would begin this year. It is to be paved with asphalt by 1964.

Ironically, in view of the past history of negotiations on the subject, the leader of the Yugoslav delegation was quoted in the Bulgarian press as having declared that the agreement constituted "a considerable contribution to the further development of economic and good neighborly relations" between the two countries.

WHERE COMMUNISM GOES HUNGER FOLLOWS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the story of the impact of communism on the hunger of peoples of the world continues to develop. A recent article published in the New York Times entitled "Rise in Food Prices in Havana Continues as Quality Declines. Survey Finds

Poorer Grade of Rice Now Costs More Than Top Grade in 1960," spells this out in another specific way. We have seen it occur in country after country. Again the real failure of communism has been in agriculture, just as our shining success—our greatest economic success—has been in agriculture production.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RISE IN FOOD PRICES IN HAVANA CONTINUES AS QUALITY DECLINES

HAVANA, August 17.—The prices of many foods have risen steadily in Havana over the last 2 years, while the quality has gone down, a survey by diplomats shows.

On certain rationed items prices have gone up even though they are controlled by the Government.

Prices in Cuba are expressed in pesos and centavos, or hundredths of a peso. The Cuban peso cannot be freely converted into foreign exchange, but the government of Premier Fidel Castro has pegged it at par with the U.S. dollar.

The survey made these findings:

Rice, Cuba's staple grain, retailed at 16 centavos a pound in 1960 in a first-class variety. The same amount of second-class rice—small, grayish grains—costs the housewife 19 to 22 centavos now. The black market price is 2 pesos a pound.

Onions have gone up from 5 centavos in 1960 to 15 a pound in 1962.

Oranges rose from 2 to 5 centavos each. Once plentiful and easily available, they are now obtainable only under medical orders.

Beef fileet was 79 centavos a pound two years ago. When available, it can be had at 20 pesos. The black market offers it sporadically for 5 pesos. Beef is rationed at 12 ounces a week for each person.

SOME PRICES STABLE

Chickens went from 35 to 55 centavos a pound. Cubans receive one chicken a month under the rationing plan, but can occasionally obtain an extra fryer from understanding peasants, who ask 2.50 pesos a pound.

Toilet soap, also rationed, sells for 16 centavos a cake and only one brand is available. In 1960 any soap of quality comparable to that made in the United States retailed for 14 centavos.

Several items have not shown increases. Bread, milk and fish still sell at the same prices. Milk and fish are rationed, but bread is sold freely in the Havana area.

Travelers report that in Camaguey, a cattle center 390 miles east of Havana, the sale of bread is regulated.

Some expenses have decreased. Rents were slashed 50 percent after the regime took over all real estate property. A housing shortage persists.

Electric power rates dropped in Havana, as did hotel room prices.

But a first-rate meal at a restaurant that once was 5 pesos now cannot be had for twice that amount. The researchers found that a second-rate meal—no beef, milk, or butter, or fresh vegetables—costs the average 1962 customer 8 pesos.

In more popularly priced cafeterias the case is the same. An irate worker recently wrote to a newspaper complaining that he had to pay 1.30 pesos for a plate of rice and fish that had little rice and less fish.

NO SOCKS FOR SALE

The diplomats found that sheets, nylon hose and men's socks and handkerchiefs had disappeared from stores.

No good footwear was found. Second-rate shoes for men cost 15 pesos. Bitter complaints about the workmanship on shoes are often heard and have been reported in the press.

The short supply of consumer goods and the rationing of food, plus fears of a new monetary reform, leaves many Cubans with plenty of cash. This accounts for thriving bars and dance halls.

American cigarettes are sold on the black market at 2 to 5 pesos a pack.

FREEDOM ACADEMY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, commented on the Freedom Academy, how it has been stalled in the Congress of the United States, and how it is opposed by extremists of both right and left. I am a cosponsor of the Freedom Academy bill. I think it would help us very greatly in the struggle against communism.

I ask unanimous consent that the excellent article by Roscoe Drummond be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM ACADEMY STALLED; TWO-WAY SUSPICION BLAMED (By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—One of the most hurtful sources of disunity in the United States today is the gathering suspicion between liberals and conservatives over the conduct of the cold war.

Many liberals are afraid that the conservatives are willing to hurt civil liberty and many conservatives are afraid that the liberals are willing to help communism.

The result is that things which the United States ought to be urgently doing, if we are going to do more than hold our own in this contest for keeps with communism, either get lost in the scuffle or sidetracked through mutual distrust.

This isn't just an abstract controversy. It affects specific actions. Take the case of the bill to establish a Freedom Academy designed to train thousands of free world leaders in the arts of successfully waging the cold war against communism—in the way the military academies train officers for their assignments. Since the convening of the present Congress a year ago last January, this bill has been stalled and stymied at every turn despite wide public support and bipartisan backing.

Why? What holds it up? Is it argument over the need to do what the Freedom Academy would be created to do—or something else?

Democratic Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, who knows more than most about what goes on in Congress, gives this answer in his new book, "Freedom and Foreign Policy."

"Last year this bill passed the Senate but failed in the House because of suspicions by hard anti-Communists there that the Freedom Academy would be infiltrated and taken over by pro-Communists or liberals who were soft on communism.

"This year the bill has been buried in the Senate; largely, I am inclined to believe, because of the fear of liberals that the Freedom Academy would become a sort of fortress of militant anticommunism, manned by conservative thinkers.

"This is the price we pay for suspicion and division between liberals and conservatives." There is plenty of evidence to support Senator Dodd's appraisal. When the Freedom Academy bill came before Congress, most

August 20

of the liberal weeklies took up arms against it principally on the ground that it would become a tool of the extreme conservatives and a toy of the John Birch Society.

Now the John Birch Society is opposing it for exactly the same reason in reverse—that it would become “just another means, and a very powerful one, for brainwashing our young American patriots and pulling wool over the eyes of the American people.”

The foregoing appears in the July issue of Robert Welch's Birch Society Bulletin, which after sarcastically suggesting (saying it is only “kidding”) an improbable and for the most part ill-equipped staff, advised its members that the Freedom Academy “could easily become one of the steps leading to our loss of freedom.”

This kind of right-left, liberal-conservative distrust—certainly as far as the great body of the American people is concerned—is a poison coming from the extremists on both sides and from which we ought to inoculate our minds.

At the moment, Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Representative FRANCIS WALTER, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, are preventing the Freedom Academy bill from having public hearings. Shouldn't these two distinguished Congressmen be acting to dissolve the suspicions between liberals and conservatives in the common cause of waging the cold war more effectively—rather than lending themselves to this distrust?

“On the question of communism and how to deal with it,” Senator DONN wisely remarks, “Neither Republicans nor Democrats, neither liberals nor conservatives, have had a monopoly on wisdom or on folly.”

It seems to me we ought to ignore the extremists of both left and right—and get on with the job, however much it takes, however long it takes, to work for the worldwide triumph of freedom.

TELEVISION EDITORIALS EXTEND VITALLY NEEDED PUBLIC DIS- CUSSION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most heartening developments for those who believe in freedom of speech and freedom of expression and dissent in our society has been the development of television editorials. I am somewhat concerned with that development, because by and large television stations are owned by people whose economic and political views often contradict my own. But there is a dearth of strong voices in controversy in our cities. Many of our cities now have one-newspaper ownership. Milwaukee has been the latest victim. The Milwaukee Journal now owns the Milwaukee Sentinel. Nevertheless, we are keeping differences alive by television editorials.

One of the finest jobs being done in that field is by WITI-TV in Milwaukee. That television station recently carried a very thoughtful editorial on the loss of Government contracts by Wisconsin and by the Milwaukee area, particularly in the defense area and in research and development. I ask unanimous consent that this very thoughtful, appropriate, and accurate editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the television editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We were alarmed a short time ago by some interesting figures out of Washington, figures that indicated Wisconsin is getting lost in

the shuffle for a fair share of the Nation's defense research budget. It was a particularly hard knock for the Milwaukee area, which has long considered itself a major industrial center complete with fine facilities.

Yet out of \$431 million spent last year for basic research, Wisconsin's share came to a meager \$1 million.

Our share of \$22 billion defense total came to a negligible 1 percent.

The first reaction to the figures was indignation. Why, we asked, should California and eastern seaboard States reap three-fourths of all prime contracts for research and development? Part of the answer, at least, is clearly evident. These States, perhaps by accident, are geared for the new and fast developing missile and electronic fields.

The Milwaukee Association of Commerce recognized the situation early. They've felt for the past 2 years that our industry and our universities will have to integrate their research activity, build a scientific complex equal to those in the East and in California. Working with Congressman REUSS, the association has set up a conference for August 25. Two top aides to Defense Secretary McNamara will be here to speak to industrial, educational, and civic leaders. They'll discuss the technological needs of Government defense and economic aspects of it. Our local people will be able to tell them about out potential—what we can do. Much can come from this meeting.

Here in Wisconsin, we've got the basic resources; we've got our industry and our universities. Channel 6 believes if we can coordinate them, we'll have a science complex comparable to any in the Nation.

ENGLAND AND THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the recent suspension of negotiations between the United Kingdom and the Common Market on Britain's projected entry into the Common Market affords us an opportunity to reevaluate our position concerning Britain's entry into the Common Market and concerning our own projected dealings with the Common Market area.

The position of this administration has been to push as hard as possible for British admission into the Common Market. The administration believes that there are very compelling reasons why the United Kingdom should be a part of the European Economic Community. But there are some very compelling reasons why Britain should not join. Therefore I should like to have printed in the RECORD a very excellent article by Leonard Beaton published in the Manchester Guardian Weekly on Thursday, August 9, 1962, entitled “EEC: The case against joining.”

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EEC: THE CASE AGAINST JOINING

(The second of two articles)

(By Leonard Beaton)

The political risks of staying out of the European Community and the positive opportunities which full membership will offer are clear enough. Together they form a political case for going in. There is also a powerful case for staying out which rests negatively on the dangers which membership will bring and positively on the pros-

pects which independence, the American Alliance, and the worldwide Commonwealth Community offer to Britain. The opposition case is being put to the British public in many different ways, some of them painfully primitive; but an argument is no less valid for poor advocacy and the absence of opposition in, for example, the serious press can be attributed as much to confusion as to the common sentiment of reasonable men.

The case against entry must rest primarily on the proposition that the Europe of anything from 7 to 14 (if Ireland, Norway, Denmark, Greece, Spain, Portugal, and Turkey are ultimately included) is the wrong group for Britain. It excludes her principal ally, the United States, and to that extent it endangers the alliance which has been constructed with such effort and patience since 1940. This fact is concealed by the American grand design to make Europe a great power in its own right and so strengthen the free world. The Americans hope that this will free them from their heavy commitments in Europe to deal with the growing problems of South America and the possible expansion of China in Asia.

Splitting the free world in this way answers that instinct in most Americans and Europeans. But in Britain, at least, its long-term dangers should be obvious. Under the name of interdependence, it is promoting the fact of mutual independence. Once both sides enjoy the illusion of self-sufficiency, the ground has been laid for division and even conflict. As a reflection of this, the European idea has an anti-American flavor, consciously or unconsciously. One of its premises is that Europe has not had its proper place and influence in the present American (or Anglo-Saxon) system; and even in Britain this notion can be seen among the more sophisticated of the new Europeans. They are already inclined to say that Britain has not had a proper share in a Western world run from Washington. The last two decades of rugged but very healthy alliance offer very little evidence for this—though it can possibly be argued that it will come in the future. The fact is, however, that the United States is unlikely to find an ally of such reliability and community of spirit as an independent Britain. The inevitability of the alliance derives from a profoundly similar political outlook. The absence of this understanding between the United States and either Germany or France is to many obvious.

Washington apparently hopes to send the British into Europe to lead it or, as one Frenchman put it, to police it. This picture is shared by those in Britain who believe that the Six will recognize their qualities and ask them to manage the affairs of the community. This is wishful thinking and is most dangerous; and the Americans may find that they have not gained a son but lost a daughter.

The Commonwealth issue is more intimate and thus more difficult to define. It involves judgment on which there must be wide disagreement. The present confused emotions in Britain and throughout the Commonwealth are proof if ever it was needed of the family relationship which exists. Each of the British offspring (except, perhaps, New Zealand) has in its political tradition an adolescent fear that its independence might be questioned; Britain shows both parental affection and the resentment of parents at youth's apparent ingratitude.

The proper preoccupation of the Indians, Austrians, or Canadians with running their own countries and nourishing their own individuality is misunderstood in Britain as a sign that the relationship has no future. In my view, this is a profound error. The natural community of these countries and the extent to which they regard Britain as the classic expression of